arXiv:1610.00194v1 [math.PR] 1 Oct 2016

Large deviation for lasso diffusion process

Azzouz Dermoune [1], Khalifa Es-Sebaiy [2], Youssef Ouknine [2]

[1] Laboratoire Paul Painlevé, USTL-UMR-CNRS 8524, Lille, France
Email :azzouz.dermoune@univ-lille1.fr,
[2] Cadi Ayyad University Av. Abdelkrim Khattabi, 40000, Guéliz-Marrakech, Morocco
Emails : k.essebaiy@uca.ma, ouknine@uca.ma

4 octobre 2016

Abstract : The aim of the present paper is to extend the large deviation with discontinuous statistics studied in [5] to the diffusion $d\mathbf{x}^\varepsilon = -\{\mathbf{A}^\top(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}^\varepsilon - \mathbf{y}) + \mu sgn(\mathbf{x}^\varepsilon)\}dt + \varepsilon d\mathbf{w}$. The discontinuity of the drift of the diffusion discussed in [5] is equal to the hyperplane $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_1 = 0\}$, however, in our case the discontinuity is more complex and is equal to the set $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \quad \prod_{i=1}^d x_i = 0\}$.

1 Introduction

Let $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a given vector, $\mathbf{A}$ be a known matrix which maps the domain $\mathbb{R}^d$ into the domain $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mu > 0$ is a given positive real number. The sign of the real number u equals $sgn(u) = 1$ if $u > 0$, $sgn(u) = -1$ if $u < 0$ and $sgn(0)$ is any element of $[-1, 1]$. The column vector $sgn(\mathbf{x}) := (sgn(x_1), \ldots, sgn(x_p))^\top$. The following diffusion

$$d\mathbf{x}^\varepsilon = -\{\mathbf{A}^\top(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}^\varepsilon - \mathbf{y}) + \mu sgn(\mathbf{x}^\varepsilon)\}dt + \varepsilon d\mathbf{w}, \quad \mathbf{x}^\varepsilon(0) = \mathbf{x}(0) \quad \text{is given} \tag{1}$$

has a discontinuous drift. Using the fact that $\mathbf{A}^\top(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) + \mu sgn(\mathbf{x})$ is the subdifferential of the convex map

$$\frac{\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2}{2} + \mu\|\mathbf{x}\|_1$$

we can show that the latter stochastic differential equation (sde) has a unique strong solution for any $\varepsilon > 0$. See ([15, 7, 8, 17]). Here $\|\cdot\|$, $\|\cdot\|_1$ denote respectively the $l2$ and $l1$ norms.

The asymptotic property as $t \to +\infty$ is also possible. The probability density function

$$\frac{1}{Z}\exp\{-\frac{2}{\varepsilon}(\frac{\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2}{2} + \mu\|\mathbf{x}\|_1)\} := p^\varepsilon(d\mathbf{x})$$

is the unique invariant probability measure of $(\frac{\mathbf{x}_t^\varepsilon}{\varepsilon})$, see e.g. [1]. The mode of p^ε was introduced in linear regression by [18] and is called lasso. Lasso is the compact and convex set solution of the system

$$\mathbf{A}_i^\top(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})+\mu sgn(x_i)=0, \quad i=1,\dots,d. \tag{2}$$

Here $\mathbf{A}_i^\top$ denotes the i-th row of the matrix $\mathbf{A}^\top$. A large number of theoretical results has been provided for lasso see e.g. [10, 12, 18, 19, 16] and the references herein.

If (P_t^ε) is the semi-groupe defined by (1) then we have the following exponential convergence

$$\mathbb{E}_{p^\varepsilon}[|P_t^\varepsilon f-\mathbb{E}_{p^\varepsilon}(f)|^2]\le \exp(-t/C)var_{p^\varepsilon}(f), \tag{3}$$

where

$$C=4\mathbb{E}_{p^\varepsilon}[\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbb{E}_{p^\varepsilon}(\mathbf{x})\|^2].$$

The proof is a consequence of Poincaré inequality ([14, 3]) :

$$var_{p^\varepsilon}(f)\le 4\mathbb{E}_{p^\varepsilon}[\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbb{E}_{p^\varepsilon}(\mathbf{x})\|^2]\mathbb{E}_{p^\varepsilon}(\|\nabla f\|^2)$$

valid for all lipschitz map f, because p^ε is log-concave, and the fact that Poincaré inequality is equivalent to the exponential convergence (3). As a consequence we can suppose that a.s. $\sup_{t\ge 0}\|\mathbf{x}^\varepsilon(t)\|<+\infty$.

2 Limit as $\varepsilon\to 0$

Let $U:\mathbb{R}^d\to\mathbb{R}$ be a convex map such that

$$|\nabla U(x)|\le L(1+|x|), \quad \forall\, x,$$

where L is a positive constant and ∇U denotes the sub-differential of U.

It's known (see e.g. [15, 7]) that the sde

$$d\mathbf{x}^\varepsilon(t)\in -\nabla U(\mathbf{x}^\varepsilon(t))dt+\varepsilon d\mathbf{w}_t, t\in[0,T]$$

with fixed initial value $\mathbf{x}(0)$, has a unique strong solution. More precisely there exists a unique solution

$$\mathbf{x}^\varepsilon(t)=\mathbf{x}(0)-\int_0^t \mathbf{v}^\varepsilon(s)ds+\varepsilon w_t, \quad \forall t\in[0,T]$$

where the measurable map $\mathbf{v}^\varepsilon$ is such that

$$\mathbf{v}^\varepsilon(t)\in\nabla U(x_t^\varepsilon) \quad dt \text{ a.e.}$$

From the linear growth of ∇U we have

$$\|\mathbf{x}^\varepsilon(t)\| \leq K + L\int_0^t |x^\varepsilon(s)|ds,$$

where

$$K = \|x(0)\| + LT + \varepsilon \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|\mathbf{w}_t\|.$$

Gronwall's lemma tells us that

$$\|\mathbf{x}^\varepsilon(t)\| \leq K\exp(LT), \quad \forall\, t \in [0,T].$$

Using Ascoli theorem, we can extract a subsequence such that $\mathbf{x}^\varepsilon \to \mathbf{x}$ uniformely in $[0,T]$. Now using the inequality

$$\|\mathbf{v}^\varepsilon(t)\| \leq L(1 + \|\mathbf{x}^\varepsilon(t)\|) \leq C, \quad \forall\, t,$$

we derive that the sequence $(\mathbf{v}^\varepsilon)$ is weakly precompact in $L^p([0,T])$ for all $1 < p < +\infty$. Using Mazur's lemma we can construct a measurable map $\mathbf{v}$ and a subsequence such that $\mathbf{v}^\varepsilon(t) \to \mathbf{v}(t)$, dt a.e.

From the condition $\mathbf{v}^\varepsilon(t) \in \partial\, U(\mathbf{x}^\varepsilon(t))$, the convergence $(\mathbf{x}^\varepsilon(t), \mathbf{v}^\varepsilon(t)) \to (\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{v}(t))$ and the fact that ∂U is monotone maximal we have $v(t) \in \partial\, U(x(t))$ dt a.e.. Finally the limit x is the unique solution of the differential inclusion

$$dx_t \in -\partial\, U(x_t)dt.$$

See also [6].

As an application the solution $\mathbf{x}^\varepsilon$ of (1) converges as $\varepsilon \to 0$ to the inclusion equation

$$d\mathbf{x}^0(t) \in -\{\mathbf{A}^\top(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}^0(t) - \mathbf{y}) + \mu sgn(\mathbf{x}^0)\}dt, \quad \mathbf{x}^0(0) = \mathbf{x}(0). \tag{4}$$

The solution $\mathbf{x}^0(t)$ converges to lasso as $t \to +\infty$ i.e. $\mathbf{x}^0(t)$ converges to the minimizers of

$$\frac{\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2}{2} + \mu\|\mathbf{x}\|_1.$$

The set of the latter minimizers is compact. Hence

$$\sup_{t\geq 0} \|\mathbf{x}^0(t)\| < +\infty. \tag{5}$$

Then we have for some $C > 0$ and small ε that

$$\sup_{t\geq 0} \|\mathbf{x}^\varepsilon(t)\| < C \tag{6}$$

with a big a probability.

The aim of our work is to extend Boué, Dupuis, Ellis large deviation with discontinuous statistics [5] to the diffusion (1). The discontinuity in [5] is equal to the hyperplane $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_1 = 0\}$. The discontinuity of the drift of the diffusion (1) is more complex and is equal to the set $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \quad \prod_{i=1}^d x_i = 0\}$.

Before arriving to large deviation result we need some preliminary results.

3 Preliminary results

We work in the canonical probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ where $\Omega = C([0,1], \mathbb{R}^d)$ endowed with its Borel σ-field $\mathcal{F}$, and its Wiener measure $\mathbb{P}$. The canonical process $W_t : \mathbf{w} \in \Omega \to \mathbf{w}(t)$, $t \in [0,1]$ is the Wiener process under $\mathbb{P}$. The filtration $\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma(\{W_s : \quad s \leq t\}, \mathcal{N})$, $t \in [0,1]$, where $\mathcal{N}$ is the collection of the $\mathbb{P}$-null sets. The diffusion $\mathbf{x}^\varepsilon$ (1) is considered in the canonical probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Its discontinuous drift is

$$\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) := -\{\mathbf{A}^\top(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) + \mu sgn(\mathbf{x})\}. \tag{7}$$

We denote by $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}(0)}$ the mathematical expectation under the probability distribution of the solution $\mathbf{x}^\varepsilon$ known that $\mathbf{x}^\varepsilon(0) = \mathbf{x}(0)$.

I) We define for each $i = 1, \ldots, d$, the Borel measures

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_i^{\varepsilon,1}(dt) &= \mathbf{1}_{[x_i^\varepsilon(t) \leq 0]} dt, \\
\hat{\gamma}_i^{\varepsilon,1}(t) &= \mathbf{1}_{[x_i^\varepsilon(t) \leq 0]}, \\
\gamma_i^{\varepsilon,2}(dt) &= \mathbf{1}_{[x_i^\varepsilon(t) > 0]} dt, \\
\hat{\gamma}_i^{\varepsilon,2}(t) &= \mathbf{1}_{[x_i^\varepsilon(t) > 0]}.
\end{aligned}$$

By extracting a subsequence we have $\mathbf{x}^\varepsilon \to \mathbf{x}^0$ where $\mathbf{x}^0$ is the solution of the inclusion differential equation (4), and

$$(\gamma_i^{\varepsilon,\eta}(dt), i = 1, \ldots, d, \eta = 1, 2) \to (\gamma_i^\eta(dt), i = 1, \ldots, d, \eta = 1, 2)$$

where the Borel measures $(\gamma_i^\eta(dt), i = 1, \ldots, d, \eta = 1, 2)$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}
&\gamma_i^\eta(dt) = \hat{\gamma}_i^\eta(t) dt, \forall\, i = 1, \ldots, d, \eta = 1, 2, \\
&\hat{\gamma}_i^1(t) + \hat{\gamma}_i^2(t) = 1, \forall\, i = 1, \ldots, d, \\
&\hat{\gamma}_i^1(t) = 1, \quad \text{if } x_i^0(t) < 0, \\
&\hat{\gamma}_i^2(t) = 1, \quad \text{if } x_i^0(t) > 0, \\
&\hat{\gamma}_i^2(t) - \hat{\gamma}_i^1(t) := sgn(x_i^0(t)) \quad \text{if } x_i^0(t) = 0, \\
&-\{\mathbf{A}_i^\top(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}^0(t) - \mathbf{y}) - \mu\} \geq 0, \text{ and } -\{\mathbf{A}_i^\top(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}^0(t) - \mathbf{y}) + \mu\} \leq 0 \quad \text{if } x_i^0(t) = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

The property (8) tells us that $x_i^0(t)$ stays at zero when the strength

$$|\mathbf{A}_i^\top(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}^0(t) - \mathbf{y})| \leq \mu.$$

This phenomenon is known by physicist [2], and we can show it mathematically using a similar proof as in [5].

II) Now we fix $\mathbf{f}$ deterministic such that $\int_0^1 \|\mathbf{f}(t)\| dt < +\infty$. We consider the sde

$$d\mathbf{x}^\varepsilon(t) = \{\mathbf{f}(t) - \mu sgn(\mathbf{x}^\varepsilon(t))\} dt + \varepsilon d\mathbf{w}(t), \quad \mathbf{x}(0) \quad \text{is given}, \tag{9}$$

and its limit $\mathbf{x}^0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$ is the solution of the differential inclusion

$$d\mathbf{x}^0(t) \in \{\mathbf{f}(t) - \mu sgn(\mathbf{x}^0(t))\}dt, \quad \mathbf{x}(0) \quad \text{is given.} \tag{10}$$

We have dt a.e.

$$\frac{d\mathbf{x}^0(t)}{dt} = \mathbf{f}(t) - \mu\{\hat{\gamma}^2(t) - \hat{\gamma}^1(t)\}.$$

1) If $x_i^0(t) < 0$, then $\hat{\gamma}_i^2(t) = 0$, $\hat{\gamma}_i^1(t) = 1$ and

$$\frac{dx_i^0(t)}{dt} = f_i(t) + \mu.$$

2) If $x_i^0(t) > 0$, then $\hat{\gamma}_i^1(t) = 0$, $\hat{\gamma}_i^2(t) = 1$ and

$$\frac{dx_i^0(t)}{dt} = f_i(t) - \mu.$$

3) We have dt a.e on the set $\{t : \quad x_i^0(t) = 0\}$ that

$$-\mu \leq f_i(t) \leq \mu$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dx_i^0(t)}{dt} &= f_i(t) - \mu\{\hat{\gamma}_i^2(t) - \hat{\gamma}_i^1(t)\} \\ &= \hat{\gamma}_i^2(t)\{f_i(t) - \mu\} + \hat{\gamma}_i^1(t)\{f_i(t) + \mu\} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} f_i(t) &= \mu\{\hat{\gamma}_i^2(t) - \hat{\gamma}_i^1(t)\}, \\ 1 &= \hat{\gamma}_i^2(t) + \hat{\gamma}_i^1(t). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\hat{\gamma}_i^2(t) = \frac{f_i(t) + \mu}{2\mu},$$
$$\hat{\gamma}_i^1(t) = \frac{\mu - f_i(t)}{2\mu}.$$

Finally, if $x_i^0(t) = 0$, then dt a.e. $\frac{dx_i^0(t)}{dt} = 0$ and

$$\hat{\gamma}_i^2(t) = \frac{f_i(t) + \mu}{2\mu},$$
$$\hat{\gamma}_i^1(t) = \frac{\mu - f_i(t)}{2\mu}.$$

Observe that $\beta^1(t) := f_i(t) + \mu \geq 0$, $\beta^2(t) := f_i(t) - \mu \leq 0$, and $\frac{dx_i^0(t)}{dt} = \hat{\gamma}_i^2(t)\beta^2(t) + \hat{\gamma}_i^1(t)\beta^1(t)$. Observe also that $x_i^0(t) \neq 0$ if and only if $|f_i(t)| > \mu$.

By choosing f_i piecewise constant we obtain the trajectorie $\mathbf{x}$ having the following properties : There exist $0 = \tau_1 < \ldots < \tau_r = 1$ and the constants $(\beta_i(k), i = 1, \ldots, d, k = 1, \ldots, r)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &1) \frac{dx_i(t)}{dt} = \beta_i(k), \quad \forall\, t \in [\tau_k, \tau_{k+1}), \\ &2) x_i(t) \neq 0, \quad \forall\, t \in [\tau_k, \tau_{k+1}), \quad \text{or} \quad x_i(t) = 0, \quad \forall\, t \in [\tau_k, \tau_{k+1}). \end{aligned}$$

We denote by $\mathcal{N}_0$ the set of the maps $\mathbf{x} : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$ which satisfy the latter properties. It's a dense subset of $C([0,1])$.

III) Now we introduce the set

$$\mathcal{A} = \{\mathbf{v} : \Omega \times [0,1] \to \mathbb{R} : \quad \text{is progressively measurable and} \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}(0)}[\int_0^1 \|\mathbf{v}(t)\|^2 dt] < +\infty\},$$

and for $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}$ we denote by $\mathbf{x}^{\varepsilon,\mathbf{v}}$ the solution

$$d\mathbf{x}^{\varepsilon,\mathbf{v}}(t) = \{\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}^{\varepsilon,\mathbf{v}}(t)) + \mathbf{v}(t)\}dt + \varepsilon d\mathbf{w}(t), \quad \mathbf{x}^{\varepsilon,\mathbf{v}}(0) = \mathbf{x}(0),$$

where

$$\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) = -\{\mathbf{A}^\top(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}^\varepsilon - \mathbf{y}) + \mu sgn(\mathbf{x})\}.$$

Let $(\mathbf{v}^\varepsilon, \varepsilon \in (0,1]) \subset \mathcal{A}$ be a family of progressively measurable processes such that

$$\sup_{\varepsilon \in (0,1]} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}(0)}[\int_0^1 \|\mathbf{v}^\varepsilon(t)\|^2 dt] < +\infty. \tag{11}$$

We define for each $i = 1, \ldots, d$, the Borel measures

$$\begin{aligned} &\nu^\varepsilon(d\mathbf{v}, t)dt = \delta_{\mathbf{v}^\varepsilon(t)}(d\mathbf{v})dt, \\ &\nu_i^{\varepsilon,1}(d\mathbf{v}, t) = \mathbf{1}_{[x_i^\varepsilon(t) \leq 0]}\delta_{\mathbf{v}^\varepsilon(t)}(d\mathbf{v}), \\ &\nu_i^{\varepsilon,2}(d\mathbf{v}, t) = \mathbf{1}_{[x_i^\varepsilon(t) > 0]}\delta_{\mathbf{v}^\varepsilon(t)}(d\mathbf{v}), \\ &\gamma_i^{\varepsilon,1}(dt) = \mathbf{1}_{[x_i^\varepsilon(t) \leq 0]}dt, \\ &\hat{\gamma}_i^{\varepsilon,1}(t) = \mathbf{1}_{[x_i^\varepsilon(t) \leq 0]}, \\ &\gamma_i^{\varepsilon,2}(dt) = \mathbf{1}_{[x_i^\varepsilon(t) > 0]}dt, \\ &\hat{\gamma}_i^{\varepsilon,2}(t) = \mathbf{1}_{[x_i^\varepsilon(t) > 0]}. \end{aligned}$$

By extracting a subsequence we have $\mathbf{x}^{\varepsilon,\mathbf{v}^\varepsilon} \to \mathbf{x}^0$, and $\nu^\varepsilon \to \nu$. Thanks to (11), we have (see [5])

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}(0)}[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|\mathbf{v}\| \nu(d\mathbf{v}, t)] < +\infty.$$

The limit $\mathbf{x}^0$ is the solution of the differential inclusion

$$d\mathbf{x}^0(t) \in \{\mathbf{f}(t) - \mu sgn(\mathbf{x}^0(t))\}dt,$$

where

$$\mathbf{f}(t) = -\mathbf{A}^\top(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}^0(t) - \mathbf{y}) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbf{v}\nu(d\mathbf{v}, t).$$

Hence $\mathbf{x}^0$ is exactly the solution studied in (10).

4 Boué Dupuis variational representation

The variational representation of [4] tells us that for any bounded measurable map $h : (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}) \to \mathbb{R}$

$$H^\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}(0)) : = -\varepsilon^2 \ln\left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}(0)}[\exp\{-\frac{h(\mathbf{x}^\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^2}\}]\right) \tag{12}$$

$$= \inf\{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}(0)}[\frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 \|\mathbf{v}(t)\|^2 dt + h(\mathbf{x}^{\varepsilon,\mathbf{v}})] : \quad \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}\}, \tag{13}$$

where $\mathbf{x}^{\varepsilon,\mathbf{v}}$ denotes the solution

$$d\mathbf{x}^{\varepsilon,\mathbf{v}}(t) = \{\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}^{\varepsilon,\mathbf{v}}(t)) + \mathbf{v}(t)\}dt + \varepsilon d\mathbf{w}(t), \quad \mathbf{x}^{\varepsilon,\mathbf{v}}(0) = \mathbf{x}(0).$$

The control $\mathbf{v}^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{A}$ such that

$$H^\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}(0)) \geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}(0)}[\frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 \|\mathbf{v}^\varepsilon(t)\|^2 dt + h(\mathbf{x}^{\varepsilon,\mathbf{v}^\varepsilon})] - \varepsilon^2$$

and the diffusion

$$d\mathbf{x}^{\varepsilon,\mathbf{v}^\varepsilon}(t) = \{\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}^{\varepsilon,\mathbf{v}^\varepsilon}(t)) + \mathbf{v}^\varepsilon(t)\}dt + \varepsilon d\mathbf{w}(t), \quad \mathbf{x}^{\varepsilon,\mathbf{v}^\varepsilon}(0) = \mathbf{x}(0)$$

play the central role in the large deviation result [5], and then also in our case. We set

$$\bar{\mathbf{x}}^\varepsilon = \mathbf{x}^{\varepsilon,\mathbf{v}^\varepsilon}, \quad \bar{\mathbf{x}} = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \bar{\mathbf{x}}^\varepsilon.$$

Observe that Condition 3.2. in [5]

$$\sup_{\varepsilon\in(0,1]} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}(0)}[\int_0^1 \|\mathbf{v}^\varepsilon(t)\|^2 dt] < +\infty$$

holds also in our case.

5 Large deviation : upper bound

We start from the variational representation (13) :

$$H^\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}(0)) := -\varepsilon^2 \ln\{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_0}[\exp(-\frac{h(\mathbf{x}^\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^2}]\} = \inf_{\mathbf{v}\in\mathcal{A}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_0}[\frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 \|\mathbf{v}(t)\|^2 dt + h(\mathbf{x}^{\varepsilon,v})]$$

valid for all bounded measurable map h.

From the definition of $\mathbf{v}^\varepsilon$ we have

$$H^\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}(0)) \geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_0}[\frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 \|\mathbf{v}^\varepsilon(t)\|^2 dt + h(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^\varepsilon)] - \varepsilon^2.$$

It follows that

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} H^\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}(0)) \geq \liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_0}[\frac{1}{2}\int_{[0,1]\times\mathbb{R}^d} \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 \nu^\varepsilon(d\mathbf{v},t)dt + h(\bar{\mathbf{x}}^\varepsilon)]$$
$$= \liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_0}[\frac{1}{2}\int_{[0,1]\times\mathbb{R}^d} \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 \nu^\varepsilon(d\mathbf{v},t)dt + h(\bar{\mathbf{x}})].$$

From Fatou lemma we have

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_0}[\int_{[0,1]\times\mathbb{R}^d} \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 \nu^\varepsilon(d\mathbf{v},t)dt = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_0}[\int_0^1 \liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 \nu^\varepsilon(d\mathbf{v},t)dt].$$

Using the inequality

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0}\int f(\mathbf{v})\mu^n(d\mathbf{v}) \geq \int f(\mathbf{v})\mu(d\mathbf{v})$$

valid for all $f \geq 0$ measurable and all $\mu^n \to \mu$ weakly, we obtain

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 \nu^\varepsilon(d\mathbf{v},t) \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 \nu(d\mathbf{v},t).$$

Finally we have

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} H^\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}(0)) \geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}(0)}[\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^d \int_{[0,1]\times\mathbb{R}^d} |v_i|^2 \nu(d\mathbf{v},t)dt + h(\bar{\mathbf{x}})].$$

If $\bar{x}_i(t) < 0$, then

$$\frac{d\bar{x}_i}{dt}(t) = b_i^1(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t)) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v_i \nu_i^1(d\mathbf{v},t).$$

If $\bar{x}_i(t) > 0$, then

$$\frac{d\bar{x}_i}{dt}(t) = b_i^2(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t)) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v_i \nu_i^2(d\mathbf{v},t).$$

We also recall that in these cases

$$\nu_i^\eta(d\mathbf{v}, t)$$

is a probability measure for $\eta = 1, 2$. It follows from Jensen inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |v_i|^2 \nu_i^\eta(d\mathbf{v}, t) &\geq (\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v_i \nu_i^\eta(d\mathbf{v}, t))^2 \\ &\geq |\frac{d\bar{x}_i(t)}{dt} - b_i^\eta(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t))|^2 := L_i^\eta(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t), \frac{d\bar{x}_i(t)}{dt}).\end{aligned}$$

If $\bar{x}_i(t) = 0$, then $0 < \hat{\gamma}_i^1(t) < 1$, and

$$\nu(d\mathbf{v}, t) = \hat{\gamma}_i^1(t)\frac{\nu_i^1(d\mathbf{v}, t)}{\hat{\gamma}_i^1(t)} + \hat{\gamma}_i^2(t)\frac{\nu_i^2(d\mathbf{v}, t)}{\hat{\gamma}_i^2(t)}.$$

The measure $\frac{\nu_i^\eta(d\mathbf{v},t)}{\hat{\gamma}_i^\eta(t)}$ is a probability for each $\eta = 1, 2$. Again from Jensen inequality we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |v_i|^2 \frac{\nu_i^\eta(d\mathbf{v}, t)}{\hat{\gamma}_i^\eta(t)} \geq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v_i \frac{\nu_i^\eta(d\mathbf{v}, t)}{\hat{\gamma}_i^\eta(t)}\right)^2.$$

We recall that if $\bar{x}_i(t) = 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_i^1(t) &= b_i^1(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t)) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v_i \frac{\nu_i^1(d\mathbf{v}, t)}{\hat{\gamma}_i^1(t)} \geq 0, \\ \beta_i^2(t) &= b_i^2(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t)) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v_i \frac{\nu_i^2(d\mathbf{v}, t)}{\hat{\gamma}_i^2(t)} \leq 0,\end{aligned}$$

and if we denote

$$\beta_i = \frac{d\bar{x}_i}{dt}(t)$$

then

$$\hat{\gamma}_i^1(t)\beta_i^1(t) + \hat{\gamma}_i^2(t)\beta_i^2(t) = \beta_i.$$

It follows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |v_i|^2 \nu(d\mathbf{v}, t) \geq \hat{\gamma}_i^1(t)|\beta_i^1(t) - b_i^1(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t))|^2 + \hat{\gamma}_i^2(t)|\beta_i^2(t) - b_i^2(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t))|^2 \geq$$
$$\inf\{p^1|\beta_i^1 - b_i^1(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t))|^2 + p^2|\beta_i^2 - b_i^2(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t))|^2\} := L_i^0(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t), \frac{d\bar{x}_i}{dt}(t)).$$

The infimum is taken under the constraint

$$\begin{aligned}p^1, p^2 > 0, \quad p^1 + p^2 = 1, \\ p^1\beta_i^1 + p^2\beta_i^2 = \frac{d\bar{x}_i}{dt}(t) := \beta_i.\end{aligned}$$

We define

$$\tilde{L}_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t), \frac{d\bar{x}_i}{dt}(t)) = |\frac{d\bar{x}_i}{dt}(t) - b_i^1(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t))|^2 := L_i^{(1)}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t), \frac{d\bar{x}_i}{dt}(t)), \quad \text{if} \quad \bar{x}_i(t) < 0,$$
$$\tilde{L}_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t), \frac{d\bar{x}_i}{dt}(t)) = |\frac{d\bar{x}_i}{dt}(t) - b_i^2(\mathbf{x}(t))|^2 := L_i^{(2)}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t), \frac{d\bar{x}_i}{dt}(t)), \quad \text{if} \quad \bar{x}_i(t) > 0,$$
$$\tilde{L}_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t), \frac{d\bar{x}_i}{dt}(t)) := L_i^0(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t), \frac{d\bar{x}_i}{dt}(t)), \quad \text{if} \quad \bar{x}_i(t) = 0.$$

It follows for each i that

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v_i \nu(d\mathbf{v}, t)\right)^2 \geq \tilde{L}_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t), \frac{d\bar{x}_i}{dt}(t)),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} H^\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}(0)) &\geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}(0)}[\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^d \int_{[0,1]} \tilde{L}_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t), \frac{d\bar{x}_i}{dt}(t))dt + h(\bar{\mathbf{x}})] \\ &\geq \inf\{\frac{1}{2}I(\varphi) + h(\varphi) : \varphi \in C_{\mathbf{x}(0)}([0,1])\},\end{aligned}$$

where the rate function

$$I_{\mathbf{x}(0)}(\varphi) := \sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^1 \tilde{L}_i(\varphi(t), \frac{d\varphi_i}{dt}(t))dt. \tag{14}$$

The infimum is equal to $+\infty$ if the latter set is empty.

Finally we have for any sequence ε such that $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^\varepsilon \to \bar{\mathbf{x}}$, and $(\nu^\varepsilon, \nu_i^{\varepsilon,\eta}, \gamma_i^{\varepsilon,\eta}, i = 1, \ldots, d, \eta) \to (\nu, \nu_i^\eta, \gamma_i^\eta, i = 1, \ldots, d, \eta)$ that

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} H^\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}(0)) \geq \inf_{\varphi\in C([0,1])}\{\frac{1}{2}I(\varphi) + h(\varphi)\}.$$

Using the same argument as in Boué-Dupuis-Ellis [5] we can show that

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} H^\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}(0)) \geq \inf_{\varphi\in C([0,1])}\{I_{\mathbf{x}_0}(\varphi) + h(\varphi)\}$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$.

6 Large deviation : lower bound

6.1 Properties of $L_i^\eta, \eta = 0, 1, 2$

We define $L_i^0 : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \to [0, +\infty)$ by

$$L_i^0(\mathbf{x}, \beta_i) = \inf\{p^1|\beta_i^1 - b_i^1(\mathbf{x})|^2 + p^2|\beta_i^2 - b_i^2(\mathbf{x})|^2\} \tag{15}$$

The infimum is taken under the constraint

$$p^1, p^2 > 0, \quad p^1 + p^2 = 1, \quad \beta_i^1 \geq 0, \quad \beta_i^2 \leq 0$$
$$p^1 \beta_i^1 + p^2 \beta_i^2 = \beta_i.$$

Proposition. *1) If* $(\mathbf{x}, \beta_i) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ *are such that*

$$b_i^2(\mathbf{x}) < \beta_i < b_i^1(\mathbf{x})$$

then

$$L_i^0(\mathbf{x}, \beta_i) = 0.$$

2) If $\beta_i \leq b_i^2(\mathbf{x})$ *then*

$$L_i^0(\mathbf{x}, \beta_i) = |\beta_i - b_i^2(\mathbf{x})|^2.$$

3) If $\beta_i \geq b_i^2(\mathbf{x})$ *then*

$$L_i^0(\mathbf{x}, \beta_i) = |\beta_i - b_i^1(\mathbf{x})|^2.$$

Proof. Observe that

$$p|\beta_i^1 - b_i^1(\mathbf{x})|^2 + (1-p)|\beta_i^2 - b_i^2(\mathbf{x})|^2 \geq |pb_i^1(\mathbf{x}) + (1-p)b_i^2(\mathbf{x}) - \beta|^2$$

for any $p \in (0,1)$ and any couple β_i^1, β_i^2 such that $p\beta_i^1 + (1-p)\beta_i^2 = \beta$. If the infimum (15) is such that

$$L_i^0(\mathbf{x}, \beta) = p|\beta_i^1 - b_i^1(\mathbf{x})|^2 + (1-p)|\beta_i^2 - b_i^2(\mathbf{x})|^2$$

for some $p \in (0,1)$, $\beta_i^1 \geq 0$, $\beta_i^2 \leq 0$, then

$$|\beta_i^1 - b_i^1(\mathbf{x})|^2 = |\beta_i^2 - b_i^2(\mathbf{x})|^2 = |pb_i^1(\mathbf{x}) + (1-p)b_i^2(\mathbf{x}) - \beta|^2.$$

Hence

$$L_i^0(\mathbf{x}, \beta) = \inf\{|pb_i^1(\mathbf{x}) + (1-p)b_i^2(\mathbf{x}) - \beta|^2\}$$

where the infimum is also under the same constraint as in (15). This finishes the proof.

Corollary. *1) For each* $i = 1, \ldots, d$, $\eta = 0, 1, 2$, *the maps* $(\mathbf{x}, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \to L_i^\eta(\mathbf{x}, \beta)$ *are continuous.*

2) If $\beta_i \leq 0$, *then* $L_i^0(\mathbf{x}, \beta_i) \leq L_i^2(\mathbf{x}, \beta_i)$.

3) If $\beta_i \geq 0$, *then* $L_i^0(\mathbf{x}, \beta_i) \leq L_i^1(\mathbf{x}, \beta_i)$.

4) For each $i = 1, \ldots, d$ *and for* $\mathbf{x}$ *fixed, the map* $\beta_i \to L_i^0(\mathbf{x}, \beta_i)$ *is convex.*

Now back to the large deviation lower bound. We are going to show that

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} H^{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{x}(0)) \le I_{\mathbf{x}_0}(\varphi) + h(\varphi)$$

for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{N}_0$. The map φ is defined by $(t_k, \beta(k)) : k = 1, \dots, r$ such that

$$\frac{d\varphi_i}{dt}(t) = \beta_i(k),\ t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}[,$$
$$\varphi_i(t) \neq 0,\ t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}[, \text{ or } \varphi_i(t) = 0,\ t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}[.$$

If $\varphi_i(t) = 0$ on $[t_k, t_{k+1}[$, then $\beta_i(k) := \frac{d\varphi_i}{dt}(t) = 0$ on $[t_k, t_{k+1}[$.

We consider the control

$$\mathbf{v}^1(\mathbf{x}, t) = \beta^1(k) - \mathbf{b}^1(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{v}^2(\mathbf{x}, t) = \beta^2(k) - \mathbf{b}^2(\mathbf{x})$$

for $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1})$. Here $\beta_i^1(k) = -\mu$, $\beta_i^2(k) = \mu$ if $\beta_i(k) = 0$. Observe that $0 = \frac{\beta_i^1(k)+\beta_i^2(k)}{2}$. If $\beta_i(k) \neq 0$, then $\beta_i^1(k) = \beta_i^2(k) = \beta_i(k)$.

Now define for $i = 1, \dots, d$,

$$v_i(\mathbf{x}, t) = v_i^1(\mathbf{x}, t)\mathbf{1}_{[x_i \le 0]} + v_i^2(\mathbf{x}, t)\mathbf{1}_{[x_i > 0]},$$

and $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ denotes the vector column with the components $v_i(\mathbf{x}, t)$. The controlled process

$$\begin{aligned} dx_i^{\varepsilon,\varphi}(t) &= b_i(\mathbf{x}^{\varepsilon}(t))dt + v_i(\mathbf{x}^{\varepsilon}(t), t)dt + \varepsilon dw_i(t) \\ &= \{\beta_i^2(k)\mathbf{1}_{[x_i^{\varepsilon,\varphi}(t) > 0]} + \beta_i^1(k)\mathbf{1}_{[x_i^{\varepsilon,\varphi}(t) \le 0]}\}dt + \varepsilon dw_i(t) \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Let us define

$$\begin{aligned} f_i(k) = \beta_i(k) + \mu, &\quad t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}), \quad \varphi_i(t_k) > 0, \\ f_i(k) = \beta_i(k) - \mu, &\quad t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}), \quad \varphi_i(t_k) < 0, \\ f_i(k) = 0, &\quad t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}), \quad \varphi_i(t_k) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then we can rewrite (16) as

$$dx_i^{\varepsilon,\varphi}(t) = \{f_i(t) - \mu sgn(x_i^{\varepsilon,\varphi}(t))\}dt + \varepsilon dw_i(t)$$

where

$$f_i(t) = f_i(k), \quad t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}).$$

It follows from (9) that $\mathbf{x}^{\varepsilon,\varphi}$ converges to φ as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

From the variational representation

$$H^{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{x}(0)) = \inf_{\mathbf{v}\in\mathcal{A}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}(0)}[\frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 \|\mathbf{v}(t)\|^2 dt + h(\mathbf{x}^{\varepsilon,\mathbf{v}})]$$

we have

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} H^{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{x}(0)) \leq \limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}(0)}[\frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 \|\frac{d\varphi}{dt}(t) - \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}^{\varepsilon,\varphi}(t))\|^2 dt + h(\mathbf{x}^{\varepsilon,\varphi})]$$
$$= [\frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 \|\frac{d\varphi}{dt}(t) - \mathbf{b}(\varphi(t))\|^2 dt + h(\varphi)],$$

where

$$\int_0^1 \|\frac{d\varphi}{dt}(t) - \mathbf{b}(\varphi(t))\|^2 dt = \sum_{i=1}^{d}\int_0^1 |\frac{d\varphi_i}{dt}(t) - b_i(\varphi(t))|^2 dt$$

and

$$b_i(\varphi(t)) = b_i^1(\varphi(t)), \quad \text{if} \quad \varphi_i(t) < 0,$$
$$b_i(\varphi(t)) = b_i^2(\varphi(t)), \quad \text{if} \quad \varphi_i(t) > 0,$$

in these cases

$$|\frac{d\varphi_i}{dt}(t) - b_i(\varphi(t))|^2 = \tilde{L}_i(\varphi(t), \frac{d\varphi_i}{dt}(t)).$$

Moreover, on each interval $[t_k, t_{k+1})$ such that $\beta_i(k) = 0$ we can show that

$$|\frac{d\varphi_i}{dt}(t) - b_i(\varphi(t))|^2 := |b_i^1(\beta(k))|^2 \quad \text{if} \quad b_i^1(\beta(k)) \leq 0,$$
$$|\frac{d\varphi_i}{dt}(t) - b_i(\varphi(t))|^2 := |b_i^2(\beta(k))|^2 \quad \text{if} \quad b_i^2(\beta(k)) \geq 0,$$
$$|\frac{d\varphi_i}{dt}(t) - b_i(\varphi(t))|^2 := 0, \quad b_i^2(\beta(k)) < 0 < b_i^1(\beta(k)).$$

More precisely, if $\beta_i(k) = 0$ then

$$|\frac{d\varphi_i}{dt}(t) - b_i(\varphi(t))|^2 = L_i^0(\varphi(t), \frac{d\varphi_i}{dt}(t)).$$

Finally we have

$$\int_0^1 \|\frac{d\varphi}{dt}(t) - \mathbf{b}(\varphi(t))\|^2 dt = \int_0^1 \tilde{L}(\varphi(t), \frac{d\varphi}{dt}(t))dt$$

and then for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{N}_0$

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} H^{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{x}(0)) \leq I_{\mathbf{x}(0)}(\varphi) + h(\varphi).$$

To finish the proof of the large deviation's lower bound we need the following lemmas. The proof is the same as in Dupuis and Ellis book [13]. For the sake of completeness we will recall the proof.

Lemma 1. Let $\psi \in C_{\mathbf{x}(0)}([0,1])$ such that $\int_0^1 \tilde{L}(\psi(t),\psi'(t))dt < +\infty$. For each $\delta > 0$, there exist $\vartheta > 0$ and $\xi \in C_{\mathbf{x}(0)}([0,1])$ with the following properties

$$\sup_{t\in[0,1]} |\xi(t) - \psi(t)| \leq \delta, \quad \int_0^1 \tilde{L}(\xi(t), \frac{d\xi}{dt}(t))dt \leq \int_0^1 \tilde{L}(\psi(t), \frac{d\psi}{dt}(t))dt + \delta$$

and

$$\sup_{t\in[0,1]} \|\frac{d\xi}{dt}(t)\| \leq \vartheta.$$

Now we prove the following result.

proof. Let $c, \lambda \in (0,1)$. We define

$$\begin{aligned} D_\lambda &= \{t \in [0,1] : \quad \|\frac{d\psi}{dt}(t)\| \geq \frac{1}{\lambda}\}, \\ E_\lambda &= \{t \in [0,1] : \quad \|\frac{d\psi}{dt}(t)\| < \frac{1}{\lambda}\}. \end{aligned}$$

We construct the time-rescaling map $S_\lambda : [0,1] \to [0,+\infty)$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} S_\lambda(0) = 0, \quad \frac{dS_\lambda}{dt}(t) &= \frac{\|\frac{d\psi}{dt}(t)\|}{c(1-\lambda)} \quad \text{if} \quad t \in D_\lambda, \\ \frac{dS_\lambda}{dt}(t) &= \frac{1}{(1-\lambda)}, \quad \text{if} \quad t \in E_\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly the map $S_\lambda : [0,1] \to [0, S_\lambda(1)]$ is one to one with $S_\lambda(1) > 1$. Its inverse $T_\lambda : [0, S_\lambda(1)] \to [0,1]$. For $s \in [0, S_\lambda(1)]$ we define

$$\xi_\lambda(s) = \psi(T_\lambda(s)).$$

On the one hand

$$\|\frac{d\xi_\lambda}{dt}(t)\| \leq \max(c(1-\lambda), \frac{1}{\lambda}).$$

On the other hand the hypothesis

$$\int_0^1 \tilde{L}(\psi(t), \frac{d\psi}{dt}(t))dt := \sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^1 \tilde{L}_i(\psi(t), \frac{d\psi_i}{dt}(t))dt < +\infty$$

implies that for each i

$$\int_0^1 |\frac{d\psi_i}{dt}(t) - b_i^\eta(\psi(t))|dt < +\infty,$$

for $\eta = 1, 2$. From the triangular inequality

$$\int_0^1 |\frac{d\psi_i}{dt}(t)|dt \leq \int_0^1 |\frac{d\psi_i}{dt}(t) - b_i^\eta(\psi(t))|dt + \int_0^1 |b_i^\eta(\psi(t))|dt$$

we derive for each i that

$$\int_0^1 \|\frac{d\psi}{dt}(t)\|dt < +\infty.$$

Now the rest of the proof is the same as in Dupuis et al. We prove

$$\sup_{t\in[0,1]} \|\xi_\lambda(t) - \psi(t)\| \to 0$$

and

$$\int_0^1 \tilde{L}(\xi_\lambda(t), \frac{d\xi_\lambda}{dt}(t))dt \to \int_0^1 \tilde{L}(\psi(t), \frac{d\psi}{dt}(t))dt$$

as $\lambda \to 0$, which achieves the proof of Lemma 1.

Lemma 2. Let $\xi \in C_{\mathbf{x}(0)}([0,1])$ such that $\int_0^1 \tilde{L}(\xi(t), \frac{d\xi}{dt}(t))dt < +\infty$ and

$$\sup_{t\in[0,1]} \|\frac{d\xi}{dt}(t)\| \leq \vartheta.$$

For any $\delta > 0$ there exists $\sigma > 0$ and $\varphi^\sigma \in \mathcal{N}_0$ such that

$$\sup_{t\in[0,1]} |\xi(t) - \varphi^\sigma(t)| \leq \delta, \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^1 \tilde{L}(\varphi^\sigma(t), \frac{d\varphi^\sigma}{dt}(t))dt \leq \int_0^1 \tilde{L}(\xi(t), \frac{d\xi}{dt}(t))dt + 2\delta$$

Proof.

We define for each i

$$\begin{aligned} G_i^0 &= \{t \in [0,1] : \quad \xi_i(t) = 0\}, \\ G_i^1 &= \{t \in [0,1] : \quad \xi_i(t) < 0\}, \\ G_i^2 &= \{t \in [0,1] : \quad \xi_i(t) > 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Following Dupuis et al. for all $\sigma > 0$ there exists $B_i^0 = \bigcup_{j=1}^{J_i}[c_j(i), d_j(i)]$ such that $\xi_i(c_j(i)) = \xi_i(d_j(i)) = 0$ $d_j(i) - c_j(i) \leq \sigma$, $d_j(i) \leq c_{j+1}(i)$. We suppose that $c_1(i) = 0$ and $d_{J_i}(i) = 1$. We choose finitely many numbers $(e_j^k(i), k = 1, \ldots, K_j(i))$ such that

$$d_j(i) = e_j^1(i) < \ldots < e_j^{K_j(i)}(i) = c_{j+1}(i)$$

and

$$e_j^{k+1}(i) - e_j^k(i) < \sigma.$$

We define for each i the function φ_i^σ is piecewise linear interpolation of ξ_i with interpolation points

$$\{c_j(i), d_j(i), e_j^k(i) : \quad j = 1, \quad J_i, k = 1, \ldots, K_j(i)\}.$$

For each $\delta > 0$ there exists $\sigma_1 > 0$ such that for $0 \leq \sigma \leq \sigma_1$ implies that

$$\sup_{t\in[0,1]} |\xi_i(t) - \varphi_i^\sigma(t)| \leq \delta.$$

Clearly $\varphi_i^\sigma(t) = 0$ for all $t \in [c_j(i), d_j(i)]$, and $\varphi_i^\sigma(t) \neq 0$ for all $t \in [e_j^k(i), e_j^{k+1}(i)]$.

We define

$$\begin{aligned} a_j^\eta(i) &= \int_{c_j(i)}^{d_j(i)} \mathbf{1}_{G_i^\eta}(t)dt, \\ \beta_j^\eta(i) &= \frac{1}{a_j^\eta(i)} \int_{c_j(i)}^{d_j(i)} \frac{d\xi_i}{ds}(s)\mathbf{1}_{G_i^\eta}(s)ds. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly

$$\sum_{\eta=0,1,2} a_j^\eta(i) = d_j(i) - c_j(i).$$

Since $\xi_i(t) = 0$ implies $\frac{d\xi_i}{dt}(t) = 0$ a.s. then

$$\beta_j^0(i) = 0.$$

Since G_i^1, G_i^2 are open, then it can be written as a countable union of open intervals at each endpoint of which $\xi_i = 0$. Hence $\beta_j^\eta(i) = 0$ for $\eta = 1, 2$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} L_i^1(\xi(c_j(i)), 0) \geq L_i^0(\xi(c_j(i)), 0), \\ L_i^2(\xi(c_j(i)), 0) \geq L_i^0(\xi(c_j(i)), 0). \end{aligned}$$

We have for each i, j that

$$\int_{c_j(i)}^{d_j(i)} \tilde{L}_i(\xi(t), \frac{d\xi}{dt}(t))dt = \sum_{\eta=0,1,2} \int_{c_j}^{d_j} \mathbf{1}_{G_i^\eta}(t) L_i^\eta(\xi(t), \frac{d\xi_i}{dt}(t))dt.$$

From the continuity of L_i^η and ξ and the fact that $\sup_{t\in[0,1]} \|\frac{d\xi}{dt}(t)\| \leq \vartheta$ there exists $\sigma_2 \leq \sigma_1$ such that $\sigma \leq \sigma_2$ implies

$$\sup_{t\in[0,1]} |L_i^\eta(\xi(t), \frac{d\xi_i}{dt}(t)) - L_i^\eta(\xi(c_j(i)), \frac{d\xi_i}{dt}(t))| \leq \delta.$$

It follows that

$$\int_{c_j(i)}^{d_j(i)} \mathbf{1}_{G_i^\eta}(t) L_i^\eta(\xi(t), \frac{d\xi_i}{dt}(t))dt \geq \int_{c_j(i)}^{d_j(i)} \mathbf{1}_{G_i^\eta}(t) L_i^\eta(\xi(c_j(i), \frac{d\xi_i}{dt}(t))dt - (d_j(i) - c_j(i))\delta.$$

From the convexity of the function $\beta_i \to L_i^\eta(\mathbf{x}, \beta_i)$ for each $\mathbf{x}$ fixed and for each $\eta = 1, 2$, we have

$$\frac{1}{a_j^\eta(i)} \int_{c_j(i)}^{d_j(i)} \mathbf{1}_{G_i^\eta}(t) L_i^\eta(\xi(c_j(i), \frac{d\xi_i}{dt}(t))dt \geq L_i^\eta(\xi(c_j(i)), \beta_j^\eta(i)) = L_i^\eta(\xi(c_j(i)), 0) \geq L_i^0(\xi(c_j(i)), 0).$$

For $\eta = 0$, we have

$$\int_{c_j(i)}^{d_j(i)} \mathbf{1}_{G_i^0}(t) L_i^0(\xi(c_j(i),0)dt = a_j^0(i) L_i^0(\xi(c_j(i),0).$$

Finally, we have

$$\int_{c_j(i)}^{d_j(i)} \tilde{L}_i(\xi(t), \frac{d\xi}{dt}(t))dt \geq (d_j(i) - c_j(i)) L_i^0(\xi(c_j(i)),0) - \delta(d_j(i) - c_j(i)). \tag{17}$$

Observe that

$$\xi_i(c_j(i)) = \varphi_i^\sigma(c_j(i)),$$

but there is no guaranty that

$$\xi_l(c_j(i)) = \varphi_l^\sigma(c_j(i))$$

for $l \neq i$. However there exist $\alpha_l \leq c_j(i) \leq \beta_l$ such that

$$\xi_l(\alpha_l) = \varphi_l^\sigma(\alpha_l), \quad \xi_l(\beta_l) = \varphi_l^\sigma(\beta_l)$$
$$\beta_l - \alpha_l \leq \sigma.$$

More precisely

$$\alpha_l = c_{j_l}(l), \quad \beta_l = d_{j_l}(l)$$

for some j_l or

$$\alpha_l = e_{j_l}^{k_l}(l), \quad \beta_l = e_{j_l}^{k_l+1}(l).$$

It follows that for small σ we have

$$\xi_l(c_j(i)) \approx \varphi^\sigma(c_j(i)) \approx \varphi^\sigma(t), \quad \forall\, t \in [c_j(i), d_j(i)].$$

Then for small σ we have

$$L_i^0(\xi(c_j(i)),0) \geq L_i^0(\varphi^\sigma(t),0) - \delta, \quad \forall\, t \in [c_j(i), d_j(i)].$$

Now the inequality (17) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{c_j(i)}^{d_j(i)} \tilde{L}_i(\xi(t), \frac{d\xi}{dt}(t))dt &\geq \int_{c_j(i)}^{d_j(i)} L_i^0(\varphi^\sigma(t), \frac{d\varphi_i^\sigma}{dt}(t))dt - 2\delta(d_j(i) - c_j(i)) \\ &= \int_{c_j(i)}^{d_j(i)} \tilde{L}_i(\varphi^\sigma(t), \frac{d\varphi_i^\sigma}{dt}(t))dt - 2\delta(d_j(i) - c_j(i)).\end{aligned}$$

The same proof shows that

$$\int_{e_j^k(i)}^{e_j^{k+1}(i)} \tilde{L}_i(\xi(t), \frac{d\xi}{dt}(t))dt \geq \int_{e_j^k(i)}^{e_j^{k+1}} \tilde{L}_i(\varphi^\sigma(t), \frac{d\varphi_i^\sigma}{dt}(t))dt - 2\delta(e_j^{k+1}(i) - e_j^k(i)).$$

Finally

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^1 \tilde{L}(\xi(t), \frac{d\xi}{dt}(t))dt = \sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^1 \tilde{L}_i(\xi(t), \frac{d\xi}{dt}(t))dt \\
= \quad &\sum_{i=1}^d \{\sum_{j=1}^{J_i} (\int_{c_j(i)}^{d_j(i)} \tilde{L}_i(\xi(t), \frac{d\xi}{dt}(t))dt + \sum_{k=1}^{K_j(i)} \int_{e_j^k(i)}^{e_j^{k+1}(i)} \tilde{L}_i(\xi(t), \frac{d\xi}{dt}(t))dt)\} \\
&\geq \int_0^1 \tilde{L}(\varphi^\sigma(t), \frac{d\varphi^\sigma}{dt}(t))dt - 2\delta.
\end{aligned}$$

Now back to the upper bound. Let $\tau > 0$ and $\psi \in C_{\mathbf{x}(0)}([0,1])$ such that

$$I_{\mathbf{x}(0)}(\psi) \leq \inf\{I_{\mathbf{x}(0)}(\varphi) : \varphi \in C([0,1])\} + \tau,$$

and then

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \to 0} H^\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}(0)) \leq \inf\{I_{\mathbf{x}(0)}(\varphi) + h(\varphi) : \quad \varphi \in C([0,1])\} + 2\tau$$

for any $\tau > 0$.

Finally we obtain for any continuous and bounded map h that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} H^\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}(0)) = \inf\{I_{\mathbf{x}(0)}(\varphi) + h(\varphi) : \quad \varphi \in C([0,1])\}. \tag{18}$$

7 Different large deviation formulation

In general, a family of probability measure $(\mathbb{P}^\varepsilon, \varepsilon > 0)$ on a metric space (X, Δ) satisfies the large deviation principle (LDP) with the rate function I if the following conditions are satisfied :

a) $I : X \to [0, +\infty)$ is lower semi-continuous,

b) For each $r > 0$, $\{x \in X; I(x) \leq r\}$ is precompact,

c) For any $R > 0$, there exists a compact set K such that for any $\delta > 0$, we have for small ε,

$$\mathbb{P}^\varepsilon(B_\delta^c(K)) \leq \exp(-\frac{R^2}{\varepsilon^2}),$$

d) $\lim_{\delta \to 0} \liminf_{\varepsilon \to 0} \varepsilon^2 \ln\{\mathbb{P}^\varepsilon(B_\delta(x))\} = \lim_{\delta \to 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \to 0} \varepsilon^2 \ln\{\mathbb{P}^\varepsilon(B_\delta(x))\} = -I(x)$.

Here $B_\delta(K)$ denotes the δ-neighborhoods of any compact set K, and $B_\delta^c(K)$ its complement.

Let $\mathbb{P}^\varepsilon_{\mathbf{x}(0)}$ be the probability distribution of $\mathbf{x}^\varepsilon$ (1) starting from $\mathbf{x}(0)$. It's known that the limit (18) is equivalent to say that the family $(\mathbb{P}^\varepsilon_{\mathbf{x}(0)} : \varepsilon > 0)$ satisfies the LDP with the rate function $I_{\mathbf{x}(0)}$ (14). See [11] for a general theory of the large deviation principle.

Références

[1] S. Albeverio, V.I. Bogachev, M. Röckner. On uniqueness of invariant measures for finite and infinite dimensional diffusions Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 52 (1999), pp. 325-362

[2] A. Baule, E.G.D. Cohen, H. Touchette, A path integral approach to random motion with nonlinear friction, J. Phys. A : Math. Theor. 43, (2010).

[3] S. Bobkov. Isoperimetric and analytic inequalities for log-concave probability measures. Ann. Probab. 27(4) (1999), 1903-1921.

[4] M. Boué, P. Dupuis. A variational representation for certain functionals of Brownian motion. Ann. Probab. 26 (1998), 1641-1659.

[5] M. Boué, P. Dupuis, R.S. Ellis. Large deviations for small noise diffusions with discontinuous statistics. Prob. Theor. and Rel. Fields 116 (2000), pp. 125-148.

[6] R. Buckdahn, Y. Ouknine, M. Quincampoix. On limiting values of stochastic differential equations with small noise intensity tending to zero. Bull. Sci. Math. 133 (2009), no. 3, 229-237.

[7] E. Cépa. Problème de Skorohod multivoque. Ann. Probab. 26, no. 2 (1998), 500-532.

[8] E. Cépa. Équations différentielles stochastiques multivoques. Séminaire de Probabilités, XXIX, 86-107, Lecture Notes in Math., 1613, Springer, Berlin (1995).

[9] X. Chen. Stochastic differential inclusions, Thesis (2006), University of Edinburgh.

[10] S. S. Chen, D. L. Donoho, M. A. Saunders. Atomic Decomposition by Basis Pursuit. SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 20(1) (1998), 33-61.

[11] A. Dembo, O. Zeitouni. Large Deviations Techniques and Applications. Jones and Bartlett, Boston (1992).

[12] A. Dermoune, D. Ounaissi and N. Rahmania. Oscillation of Metropolis-Hasting and simulated annealing algorithms around penalized least squares estimator, Math. Comput. Simulation (2015).

[13] P. Dupuis, and R. Ellis (1997). A Weak Convergence Approach to the Theory of Large Deviations. Wiley, New York.

[14] R. Kannan, L. Lovasz, M. Simonovits. Isoperimetric Problems for Convex Bodies and a Localization Lemma. Discrete Comput. Geom. 13 (1995), 541-559.

[15] P. Kree. Diffusion equation for multivalued stochastic differential equations, J. Funct Anal. 49 (1982), pp. 73-90.

[16] D. Ounaissi. Méthodes quasi-Monte Carlo et Monte Carlo : Application aux calculs des estimateurs lasso et lasso bayésien, Thesis (2016), University of Lille 1.

[17] R. Pettersson. Existence theorem and Wong-Zakai approximations for multivalued stochastic differential equations. Probability and Mathematical Statistics, 17 (1997), pp. 29-45.

[18] R. J. Tibshirani. Regression shrinkage and selection via LASSO, J.R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol. vol. 58 no. 1, 267-288. The lasso problem and uniqueness. Electron. J. Stat. 7 (1996), 1456-1490.

[19] R. J. Tibshirani. The lasso problem and uniqueness. Electron. J. Stat. 7 (2013), 1456-1490.